arXiv:1012.5906v1 [math.CV] 29 Dec 2010

GLOBAL HYPOELLIPTICITY OF THE KOHN-LAPLACIAN $\Box_b$ ON PSEUDOCONVEX CR MANIFOLDS

TRAN VU KHANH

Abstract. Let X be a complex manifold and $M \subset X$ a compact, smooth, pseudoconvex CR manifold of dimension $2n-1$. (Here $n \geq 3$ or, in case $n=2$, it is made the extra assumption that $\bar\partial_b$ has closed range on functions.) Assume that there exists a strictly CR-plurisubharmonic function in a neighborhood of M in X. In this situation, there are here proved

(i) The global existence of C^∞ solutions to the tangential Cauchy-Riemann operator $\bar\partial_b$.

(ii) The global hypoellipticity of the Kohn-Laplacian $\Box_b$, under the additional condition of "weak Property (P)".

The related result to (ii) for the complex Laplacian $\Box$ in a domain/annulus of X is also obtained (as for $\bar\partial$ it was already stated by Kohn and Shaw in [K73] and [Sh85]).

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Weighted basic estimate on a CR manifold 5
3. Kohn's Microlocalization 10
4. Global hypoellipticity for $\bar\partial_b$ 12
5. The Straube-Boas formula for Green operators 17
6. θ-compactness estimates 19
7. Global hypoellipticity for $\Box_b$ 22
Appendix 26
References 27

1. Introduction

Let M be a smooth compact manifold of odd dimension $2n-1$ in a complex manifold X, $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} X = N$ $(n \leq N)$. Denote by $T^{\mathbb{C}}M$ the distribution of complex tangent vectors; we assume that M is a CR manifold of hypersurface type (or CR manifold for short), that is, $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} T^{\mathbb{C}}M \equiv n-1$ and therefore $\dim\left(\frac{TM}{T^{\mathbb{C}}M}\right) \equiv 1$. We decompose the complexified bundle $\mathbb{C}TM$ as the direct sum of the bundles of vector fields of type $(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$ respectively, that is, $\mathbb{C}TM = T^{1,0}M \oplus T^{0,1}M$. We choose a local basis $L_1, ..., L_{n-1}$ of $(1,0)$ vector fields, the basis $\bar{L}_1, ..., \bar{L}_{n-1}$ of conjugated $(0,1)$ vector fields, and supplement them by a purely imaginary vector field $T \in TM$ transversal to $T^{1,0}M \oplus T^{0,1}M$ in such a way that a full basis of $\mathbb{C}TM$ is obtained. We denote by $\omega_1, ..., \omega_{n-1}, \bar{\omega}_1, ..., \bar{\omega}_{n-1}, \gamma$ the dual basis of 1-forms. We define the Levi form $\mathcal{L}_M$ of M as the Hermitian form $\mathcal{L}_M(L, \bar{L}') := d\gamma(L, \bar{L}')$ for L, $L' \in T^{1,0}M$. Let $(c_{ij})_{i,j=1,...,n-1}$ be the matrix of $\mathcal{L}_M$ in the above basis; Cartan formula yields

$$[L_i, \bar{L}_j] = c_{ij}T \quad \text{modulo } T^{1,0}M \oplus T^{0,1}M.$$

We assume, throughout the paper, that M is pseudoconvex, that is, the Levi form is non-negative. We denote by $\mathcal{B}^k$ the space of $(0,k)$-forms (or k-forms for short) with smooth coefficients; if $u \in \mathcal{B}^k$, then u is locally expressed as a combination

$$u = \sum_{|J|=k}{}' u_J \bar{\omega}_J,$$

of basis forms $\bar{\omega}_J = \bar{\omega}_1 \wedge ... \wedge \bar{\omega}_{j_k}$ for ordered indices $j_1 < ... < j_k$ with C^∞-coefficients u_J. We choose a Riemannian metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_z$ at each point $z \in M$ associated to the splitting

$$\mathbb{C}TM = T^{1,0}M \oplus T^{0,1}M \oplus \mathbb{C}T.$$

If dV is the element of volume for this metric, there is induced a L_2-inner product and a norm on $\mathcal{B}^k$ defined by

$$(u, v) = \int_M \langle u, v \rangle_z dV, \qquad \|u\|^2 = (u, u).$$

In general, $\|\cdot\|_s$ denotes the Sobolev H^s-norm. We also define L_2^k to be the Hilbert space obtianed by completing $\mathcal{B}^k$ under the L_2-norm.

There is a natural restriction to the $\mathcal{B}^k$'s of the de-Rham exterior complex of derivatives d that we denote $\bar{\partial}_b : \mathcal{B}^k \to \mathcal{B}^{k+1}$. We denote by $\bar{\partial}_b^* : \mathcal{B}^{k+1} \to \mathcal{B}^k$ the transposed complex of derivatives and define the Kohn-Laplacian by $\Box_b := \bar{\partial}_b\bar{\partial}_b^* + \bar{\partial}_b^*\bar{\partial}_b$. We call Levi form of a smooth function ϕ in M, the alternate form $\frac{1}{2}\big(\partial_b\bar{\partial}_b - \bar{\partial}_b\partial_b\big)\phi$ on $T^{1,0}M \oplus T^{0,1}M$; we denote by (ϕ_{ij}) the matrix, in the above basis, of the Hermitian form induced over $T^{1,0}M \times T^{0,1}M$.

Definition 1.1. Let M be a CR manifold. A smooth function λ defined in the neigborhood of M is said to be strictly CR-plurisubharmonic if $\frac{1}{2}\big(\partial_b\bar{\partial}_b - \bar{\partial}_b\partial_b\big)\phi + ad\gamma > 0$ for suitable constant a.

We remark that if either M is strictly pseudoconvex or X is a Stein manifold, then there always exists a strictly CR-plurisubhamornic function. But it does not always exist in an abstract model M in a complex manifold X, (see Grauert's example in [G]).

We begin our work by stating in Theorem 2.1 of Section 2 a version of the basic Kohn-Morrey-Hörmander estimate with weight adapted to M. Once the basic estimate is settled, there is a well established L_2 theory for $\bar\partial_b$ over a pseudoconvex CR manifold in presence of a strictly CR-plurisubharmonic function. Further, one can lift the estimate from L_2 to H^s along the guidelines of Kohn [K73] to get existence of global C^∞ solutions for $\bar\partial_b$. The most general results in this respect have been obtained by Kohn and Nicoara.

- In [K86] Theorem 5.3, Kohn showed that if M is a boundary of a smooth complex manifold such that M is compact and pseudoconvex and if there exists a strictly plurisubharmonic function defined in a neigborhood of M, then $\bar\partial_b$ has global C^∞ solutions.
- In [N06] and [KN06], Nicoara and Kohn proved existence of global C^∞ solutions on a compact, orientable, pseudoconvex CR manifold of dimension $(2n-1)$, embedded in $\mathbb{C}^N$, $(n \leq N)$, (for $n \geq 3$ and, in the case $n = 2$, under the additional hypothesis that $\bar\partial_b$ has closed range on functions).

As a byproduct of our preparation, we can restate in a slightly more general form the above conclusions (without the orientability assumption and for an abstract CR manifold).

Theorem 1.2. *Let M be a CR manifold of dimension $2n-1$ endowed with a strongly CR-plurisubharmonic function (here $n \geq 3$, or in the case $n = 2$ with the additional hypothesis that $\bar\partial_b$ has closed range on functions). Then the operator $\bar\partial_b$ has closed range in H^s for any $s \geq 0$. Moreover, for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ the equation*

$$\bar\partial_b u = f \qquad \text{for any } f \in \mathcal{B}^k \text{ satisfying} \begin{cases} \bar\partial_b f = 0 & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq n-2 \\ f \perp ker(\bar\partial^*) & \text{if } k = n-1, \end{cases}$$

has a solution $u \in \mathcal{B}^{k-1}$.

The proof is contained in Section 4 below. It consists in using a basic estimate with a weight which has a big Levi form so that these are lifted from L_2 to H^s and in applying a standard approximation procedure.

The space of harmonic k-forms $\mathcal{H}^k := \ker \Box_b$ coincides with $\ker \bar\partial_b \cap \ker \bar\partial_b^*$ and is finite-dimensional with $1 \leq k \leq n-2$. Moreover both $\bar\partial_b$ and $\bar\partial_b^*$ have closed range and we have the estimate

$$\|u\| \leq c(\|\bar\partial_b u\| + \|\bar\partial_b^* u\|) \quad \text{for } u \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial_b) \cap Dom(\bar\partial_b^*) \cap \mathcal{H}^{k\,\perp}, \tag{1.1}$$

for any $0 \leq k \leq n-1$. This implies in particular that $\Box_b$ maps $\mathcal{H}^k$ into itself and has a complex bounded inverse there.

Definition 1.3. The inverse of the induced operator by $\Box_b$ over $\mathcal{H}^{k\,\perp}$ is denoted by G_k and is called the Green operator.

As for the global hypoellipticity of $\Box_b$, or the regularity of its inverse G_k, when M is the boundary of a domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$, it was proved by Boas-Straube [BS91] in case M admits a plurisubharmonic defining function. A further result has been obtained by Raich [R10] who proved global regularity if M is a smooth, orientable, pseudoconvex CR manifold of hypersurface type of real dimension at least five that satisfies a pair of potential-theoretical conditions that he names properties (CR-P_q) and (CR-P_{n-1-q}). With independent technique, Straube gets in [S10] the same conclusion without assuming that M is orientable.

The main goal of this paper consists in stating regularity under a weaker hypothesis. For this, notice that along with the T-components of commutators $[L_i, \bar{L}_j]$ which represent the Levi form of M, a crucial role is played by the T-components of $[L_i, T]$ that we denote by θ_i:

$$[L_i, T] = \theta_i T \quad \text{modulo } T^{1,0}M \oplus T^{0,1}M; \tag{1.2}$$

we also introduce the notation $|\theta u|^2 = \sum'_{|K|=k-1} |\sum_{j\le n-1} \theta_j u_{jK}|^2$ for $u \in \mathcal{B}^k$. With this preliminary, we are ready to introduce the " Property $(\theta - P_q)$" inspired to the classical theory by Catlin [C84] and its further development by the author in [Kh10].

Definition 1.4. Let M be a CR manifold and let z_o a point of M, q an index $1 \le q \le n-1$. We say that M has property $(\theta - P_q)$ at z_o if for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a vector field $\theta = (\theta_j)$ defined by (1.2) under a choice of T in a neighborhood U of z_o on M and a function $\phi^\epsilon \in C^\infty(U)$ such that for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k$ we have

$$\begin{cases} |\phi^\epsilon| \le 1, \\ \epsilon \sum'_{|K=q-1|} \sum_{ij} \phi^\epsilon_{ij} u_{iK} \bar{u}_{jK} \ge |\theta u|^2 \end{cases} \quad \text{on } U. \tag{1.3}$$

We say that the Green operator G_k is regular when it preserves C^∞ smoothness; we say that it is exactly regular if it preserves H^s-smoothness for any integer s. Here is the central result of the paper.

Theorem 1.5. *Let M be a pseudoconvex, compact, smooth, CR manifold endowed with a strictly CR-plurisubharmonic function and of dimension $2n-1$ (with $n \ge 3$ or, in case $n = 2$ with the additional hypothesis that $\bar\partial_b$ has closed range). Assume that $(\theta - P_q)$ property is satisfied for $1 \le q \le \frac{n-1}{2}$; then the Green operator G_k is exactly regular for any degree $q \le k \le n-1-q$.*

The proof follows in Section 7 below. The idea which underlies the whole proof is the combination of global hypoellipticity of $\bar\partial_b$ in Section 4 and the "Boas-Straube formula on a CR manifold" in Section 5 with the "θ-compactness estimate" in Section 6. We have a final result which is about the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem. We consider a bounded pseudoconvex smooth domain Ω of a complex manifold X, or an annulus $\Omega_1 \setminus \Omega_2$ between two bounded pseudoconvex boundaries, the complex Laplacian $\Box = \bar\partial\bar\partial^* + \bar\partial^*\bar\partial$ and its inverse N_k on k-forms.

Theorem 1.6. (i) *Let Ω be a pseudoconvex domain. Assume that X is endowed with a strictly plurisubharmonic function and that $b\Omega$ has $(\theta - P_q)$ property. Then N_k is exactly globally regular for any $k \ge q$.*

(ii) *Let* $\Omega=\Omega_1\setminus\overline{\Omega}_2$ *be an annulus where* Ω_1 *and* Ω_2 *(*$\Omega_2\subset\subset\Omega_1$*) are pseudoconvex domains. Assume that* X *is endowed with a strictly plurisubharmonic function, and that* $b\Omega_1$ *and* $b\Omega_2$ *satisfy* $(\theta-P_q)$ *and* $(\theta-P_p)$ *property, respectively. Then* N_k *is exactly globally regular for any* k *with* $q\le k\le n-1-p$.

Proof. This is a consequence of the theorem about θ-compactness estimates in microlocalized version (Proposition 6.4) in combination with the equivalence between estimates in Ω and microlocalized estimates on $b\Omega$. This latter goes back to Kohn [K02] and was recently developed by the author in [Kh10], Corollary 4.13. Finally, for passing from a θ-compactness estimate for the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem to regularity one uses the same argument as in Section 7 of the present paper in its original version by Straube [S08].

□

2. WEIGHTED BASIC ESTIMATE ON A CR MANIFOLD

We choose a basis $L_1,...,L_{n-1},\bar L_1,...,\bar L_{n-1},T$ of tangent vector fields to M and the dual basis $\omega_1,...,\omega_{n-1},\bar\omega_1,...,\bar\omega_{n-1},\gamma$ of 1-forms. We express the operator $\bar\partial_b:\mathcal{B}^k\to\mathcal{B}^{k+1}$ and its adjoint $\bar\partial_b^*:\mathcal{B}^{k+1}\to\mathcal{B}^k$ in the local basis as follows. Denote $\mathcal{B}^k_c(U)=\mathcal{B}^k\cap C^\infty_c(U)$. Let $u\in\mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$, be written as

$$u=\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}u_J\bar\omega_J, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\sum'$ denotes summation over strictly increasing indices $J=j_1<...<j_k$ and where $\bar\omega_J$ denotes the wedge product $\bar\omega_J=\bar\omega_{j_1}\wedge...\wedge\bar\omega_{j_k}$. When the multiindices are not ordered, the coefficients are assumed to be alternant. Thus, if J decomposes as $J=jK$, then $u_{jK}=\epsilon^{jK}_J u_J$ where ϵ^{jK}_J is the sign if the permutation $jK\overset{\sim}{\to}J$. Then we have

$$\bar\partial_b u=\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\Big(\sum_{i\le j}\bar L_i u_{jK}-\bar L_j u_{iK}+\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}a^J_{ijK}u_J\Big)\bar\omega_i\wedge\bar\omega_j\wedge\bar\omega_K \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\bar\partial_b^* u=-\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_j(L_ju_{jK}+a_Ku_K)\bar\omega_K \tag{2.3}$$

where $a^J_{ijK},a_K\in C^\infty(U)$.

Recall that the coefficient c_{ij} of the Levi form $d\gamma$ is identified to the T-component of $[L_i,\bar L_j]$. We further define $-\overline{a^k_{ij}}$ to be the $\bar L_k$-component of $[L_i,\bar L_j]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{a^k_{ij}}&:=-\langle\bar\omega_k,[L_i,\bar L_j]\rangle\\ &\underset{\text{Cartan}}{=}\langle\partial_b\bar\omega_k,L_i\wedge\bar L_j\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

It follows

$$\partial_b\bar\omega_k=\sum_{ij}\overline{a^k_{ij}}\omega_i\wedge\bar\omega_j. \tag{2.5}$$

Taking conjugation yields

$$\bar\partial_b\omega_k=-\sum_{ij}a^k_{ji}\omega_i\wedge\bar\omega_j. \tag{2.6}$$

Using again Cartan's formula we conclude that a^k_{ji} coincides with the L_k-component of $[L_i,\bar L_j]$. Thus the full commutator is expressed by

$$[L_i,\bar L_j]=c_{ij}T-\sum_k\overline{a^k_{ij}}\bar L_k+\sum_k a^k_{ji}L_k. \tag{2.7}$$

For a smooth function ϕ we want to describe the matrix (ϕ_{ij}) of the Hermitian form $\frac12\big(\partial_b\bar\partial_b-\bar\partial_b\partial_b\big)\phi$. Now, $\bar\partial_b\phi=\sum_k\bar L_k(\phi)\bar\omega_k$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_b\bar\partial_b\phi&=\partial_b(\sum_k\bar L_k(\phi)\bar\omega_k)\\ &\underset{\text{by (2.5)}}{=}\sum_{ij}\left(L_i\bar L_j(\phi)+\sum_k\overline{a^k_{ij}}\bar L_k(\phi)\right)\omega_i\wedge\bar\omega_j.\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar\partial_b\partial_b\phi&=\bar\partial_b(\sum_k L_k(\phi)\omega_k)\\ &\underset{\text{by (2.6)}}{=}\sum_{ij}\left(-\bar L_jL_i(\phi)-\sum_k a^k_{ji}L_k(\phi)\right)\omega_i\wedge\bar\omega_j.\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Combining (2.8) with (2.9) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{ij}&=\langle\frac12\big(\partial_b\bar\partial_b-\bar\partial_b\partial_b\big)(\phi),L_i\wedge\bar L_j\rangle\\ &=\frac12\left(L_i\bar L_j(\phi)+\bar L_jL_i(\phi)+\sum_k\Big(\overline{a^k_{ij}}\bar L_k(\phi)+a^k_{ji}L_k(\phi)\Big)\right)\\ &=\bar L_jL_i(\phi)+\frac12\left([L_i,\bar L_j](\phi)+\sum_k\Big(\overline{a^k_{ij}}\bar L_k(\phi)+a^k_{ji}L_k(\phi)\Big)\right)\\ &\underset{\text{by (2.7)}}{=}\bar L_jL_i(\phi)+\frac12c_{ij}T(\phi)+\sum_k a^k_{ji}L_k(\phi).\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

We will work with the weighted L^ϕ_2-norm defined by

$$\|u\|^2_\phi=(u,u)_\phi:=\|ue^{-\frac{\phi}{2}}\|^2=\int_M\langle u,u\rangle e^{-\phi}dS.$$

Let $\bar\partial^*_{b,\phi}$ be the L^ϕ_2-adjoint of $\bar\partial_b$. It is easy to see that

$$\bar\partial^*_{b,\phi}u = -\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}^{'}\sum_j(\delta^\phi_j u_K + a_K u_K)\bar\omega_K \tag{2.11}$$

where $\delta^\phi_j\varphi := e^\phi L_j(e^{-\phi}\varphi)$. Notice that

$$\bar\partial^*_{b,\phi}u = \bar\partial^*_b u + \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}^{'}\sum_j L_j(\phi)u_{jK}\bar\omega_K \tag{2.12}$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}
[\delta^\phi_i, \bar L_j] &= \bar L_j L_i(\phi) + [L_i, \bar L_j] \\
&\underset{\text{by (2.10) and (2.7)}}{=} \phi_{ij} - \frac{1}{2}c_{ij}T(\phi) - \sum_k a^k_{ji}L_k(\phi) + c_{ij}T - \sum_k \overline{a^k_{ij}}\bar L_k + \sum_k a^k_{ji}L_k \\
&= \phi_{ij} - \frac{1}{2}c_{ij}T(\phi) + c_{ij}T - \sum_k \overline{a^k_{ij}}\bar L_k + \sum_k a^k_{ji}\delta^\phi_k.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

By developing the equalities (2.2) and (2.11), we get the Kohn-Morrey-Hömander inequality for a CR manifold.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $z_0 \in M$, ϕ be a real C^2 function, and let q_o be an integer with $0 \le q_o \le n-1$. Then, there exists a neighborhood U of z_0 and a constant C (independent of ϕ) such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\bar\partial_b u\|^2_\phi + \|\bar\partial^*_{b,\phi}u\|^2_\phi + C\|u\|^2_\phi \\
&\quad\ge \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}^{'}\sum_{ij}(\phi_{ij}u_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi - \sum_{|J|=k}{}^{'}\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}(\phi_{jj}u_J, u_J)_\phi \\
&\quad\quad + \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}^{'}\sum_{ij}(c_{ij}Tu_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi - \sum_{|J|=k}{}^{'}\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}(c_{jj}Tu_J, u_J)_\phi \\
&\quad\quad + \frac{1}{2}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}\|\delta^\phi_j u\|^2_\phi + \sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n}\|\bar L_j u\|^2_\phi\Big)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$.

Proof. Let Au denote the sum in (2.2); we have

$$\|Au\|^2_\phi = \sum_{|J|=k}{}^{'}\sum_j\|\bar L_j u_J\|^2_\phi - \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}^{'}\sum_{ij}(\bar L_i u_{jK}, \bar L_j u_{iK})_\phi. \tag{2.15}$$

Let Bu denote the sum in (2.11); we have

$$\|Bu\|^2_\phi = \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij} (\delta^\phi_i u_{iK}, \delta^\phi_j u_{jK})_\phi. \tag{2.16}$$

Remember that Au and Bu differ from $\bar\partial u$ and $\bar\partial^*_\phi u$ by terms of order 0 which do not depend on ϕ. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\bar\partial u\|^2_\phi + \|\bar\partial^*_\phi u\|^2_\phi \\
&\qquad = \|Au\|^2_\phi + \|Bu\|^2_\phi + R \\
&\qquad = \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_j \|\bar L_j u_J\|^2_\phi + \mathrm{Re}\Big(\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij} (\delta^\phi_i u_{iK}, \delta^\phi_j u_{jK})_\phi - (\bar L_j u_{iK}, \bar L_i u_{jK})_\phi + R \Big),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

where R is an error coming from the scalar product of 0-order terms with terms $\bar L_j u_J$, $L_j u_{jK}$ or u.

We want to apply now integration by parts to the term $(\delta^\phi_i u_{iK}, \delta^\phi_j u_{jK})_\phi$ and $(\bar L_j u_{iK}, \bar L_i u_{jK})_\phi$. Notice that for each $\varphi, \psi \in C^1_c(U\cap M)$, we have

$$\begin{cases} (\varphi, \delta^\phi_j \psi)_\phi &= -(\bar L_j \varphi, \psi)_\phi + (a_j \varphi, \psi)_\phi \\ -(\varphi, \bar L_i \psi)_\phi &= (\delta^\phi_i \varphi, \psi)_\phi - (b_i \varphi, \psi)_\phi \end{cases}$$

and for some $a_j, b_i \in C^1(U\cap M)$ independent of ϕ.

This immediately implies

$$\begin{cases} (\delta^\phi_i u_{iK}, \delta^\phi_j u_{jK})_\phi &= -(\bar L_j \delta^\phi_i u_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi + R \\ -(\bar L_j u_{iK}, \bar L_i u_{jK})_\phi &= (\delta^\phi_i \bar L_j u_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi + R \end{cases} \tag{2.18}$$

From here on, we denote by R terms involving the product of u by $\delta^\phi_j u$ or $\bar L_j u$ for $j \le n-1$ but not twice a derivative of u. Taking the sum of two terms in the right side of (2.18), we get

$$(\delta^\phi_i u_{iK}, \delta^\phi_j u_{jK})_\phi - (\bar L_j u_{iK}, \bar L_i u_{jK})_\phi = ([\delta^\phi_i, \bar L_j] u_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi + R. \tag{2.19}$$

Notice that (2.18) is also true if we replace both u_{iK} and u_{jK} by u_J for indices $i = j \le q_0$. Then we obtain

$$\|\bar L_j u_J\|^2_\phi = \|\delta^\phi_j u_J\|^2_\phi - ([\delta^\phi_j, \bar L_j] u_J, u_J)_\phi + R. \tag{2.20}$$

Applying (2.19) and (2.20) to the last line in (2.17), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|\bar\partial u\|^2_\phi + \|\bar\partial^*_\phi u\|^2_\phi \\
&\qquad = \mathrm{Re}\Big(\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{i,j=1}([\delta^\phi_i, \bar L_j]u_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi - \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=1}^{q_0}([\delta^\phi_j, \bar L_j]u_J, u_J)_\phi + R\Big) \\
&\qquad + \sum_{|J|=k}{}'\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}\|\delta^\phi_j u_J\|^2_\phi + \sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n-1}\|\bar L_j u_J\|^2_\phi\Big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.21}
$$

We replace in (2.21) the expression (2.13) for $[\delta^\phi_i, \bar L_j]$ and remark that the last two sums in the commutator produce an expression $(\sum_k(-\overline{a^k_{ij}}\bar L_k + a^k_{ji}\delta^\phi_k)u_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi$ which is an error term R. This yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|\bar\partial u\|^2_\phi + \|\bar\partial^*_\phi u\|^2_\phi \\
&\qquad = \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij=1}(\phi_{ij}u_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi - \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=1}^{q_0}(\phi_{jj}u_J, u_J)_\phi \\
&\qquad + \mathrm{Re}\Big(\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij=1}(c_{ij}Tu_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi - \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=1}^{q_0}(c_{jj}Tu_J, u_J)_\phi + R\Big) \\
&\qquad - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Re}\Big(\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij=1}(c_{ij}T(\phi)u_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi - \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=1}^{q_0}(c_{jj}T(\phi)u_J, u_J)_\phi\Big) \\
&\qquad + \sum_{|J|=k}{}'\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}\|\delta^\phi_j u_J\|^2_\phi + \sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n}\|\bar L_j u_J\|^2_\phi\Big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.22}
$$

Notice that $\mathrm{Re}z = \mathrm{Re}\bar z$, $\bar T = -T$ and that (c_{ij}) is a hermitian metric, so that the fourth line in (2.22) is identically zero. We denote by S the sum in the last line in (2.22). To conclude our proof, we only need to prove that for a suitable C independent of ϕ we have

$$
R \le \frac{1}{2}\sum_{|J|=k}{}'\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}\|\delta^\phi_j u_J\|^2_\phi + \sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n-1}\|\bar L_j u_J\|^2_\phi\Big) + C\|u\|^2_\phi. \tag{2.23}
$$

In fact, if we point our attention at those terms which involve $\delta^\phi_j u$ for $j \le q_o$ or $\bar L_j u$ for $q_o+1 \le j \le n-1$, then (2.23) is clear since S carries the corresponding square $\|\delta^\phi_j u\|^2_\phi$ and $\|\bar L_j u\|^2_\phi$. Otherwise, we note that we may interchange $\bar L_j$ and δ^ϕ_j by means of integration by parts. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.1.

□

Furthermore, from (2.22) and (2.23) we also obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar\partial u\|^2_\phi+\|\bar\partial^*_\phi u\|^2_\phi\le&\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}'\sum_{ij=1}(\phi_{ij}u_{iK},u_{jK})_\phi-\sum_{|J|=k}{}'\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}(\phi_{jj}u_J,u_J)_\phi\\&+\mathrm{Re}\Big(\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}'\sum_{ij=1}(c_{ij}Tu_{iK},u_{jK})_\phi-\sum_{|J|=k}{}'\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}(c_{jj}Tu_J,u_J)_\phi\Big)\\&+\frac{3}{2}\sum_{|J|=k}{}'\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}\|\delta^\phi_j u_J\|^2_\phi+\sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n}\|\bar L_j u_J\|^2_\phi\Big)+C\|u\|^2_\phi\end{aligned}\tag{2.24}$$

for any $u\in\mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$, where C is a constant independent of ϕ.

3. KOHN'S MICROLOCALIZATION

In this section, we introduce the technique of microlocalization by Kohn and present its main consequences.

Let U be an open set in M (U may be shrunk if necessary). We choose real coordinates $x=(x',x_{2n-1})=(x_1,...x_{2n-2},x_{2n-1})$ with the origin at z_o such that $\langle\gamma,\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2n-1}}\rangle>0$ and such that if we set $z_j=x_j+\sqrt{-1}x_{j+n-1}$ for $j=1,\dots,n-1$, then we have $L_j|_{z_o}=\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}|_{z_o}$ and $T|_{z_o}=-\sqrt{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{2n-1}}|_{z_o}$. Let $\xi=(\xi_1,...,\xi_{2n-1})=(\xi',\xi_{2n-1})$ be the dual coordinates to the $(x_1,...,x_{2n-1})$'s.

Let $\mathcal{C}^+,\mathcal{C}^-,\mathcal{C}^+$ be a covering of $\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}$ such as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}^+=&\{\xi\big|\xi_{2n-1}>\frac{1}{4}|\xi'|\}\cap\{|\xi|\ge1\};\\\mathcal{C}^-=&\{\xi\big|-\xi\in\mathcal{C}^+\};\\\mathcal{C}^0=&\{\xi\big||\xi_{2n-1}|<\frac{3}{4}|\xi'|\}\cup\{\xi:|\xi|<3\}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.1}$$

Thought out this paper, we fix a smooth function ψ such that $\psi=1$ in $\{\xi\big|\xi_{2n-1}>\frac{1}{3}|\xi'|\}\cap\{|\xi|\ge2\}$ and $\mathrm{supp}\psi\subset\mathcal{C}^+$; it follows that $\mathrm{supp}(d\psi)\subset\mathcal{C}^0$. Set $\psi^+(\xi):=\psi(\xi)$; $\psi^-(\xi):=\psi(-\xi)$ and $\psi^0(\xi):=\sqrt{1-(\psi^+(\xi))^2-(\psi^-(\xi))^2}$. Define $\tilde{\psi}^0$ so that $\mathrm{supp}\tilde{\psi}^0\subset\mathcal{C}^0$ and $\tilde{\psi}^0=1$ on a neigborhood of $\mathrm{supp}\psi^0\cup\mathrm{supp}(d\psi^+)\cup\mathrm{supp}(d\psi^-)$.

Associated to a function ψ there is a pseudodifferential operator Ψ with symbol $\sigma(\Psi)=\psi$ whose action on a function $\varphi\in C^\infty_c(U)$ is defined by

$$\widehat{\Psi\varphi}(\xi)=\psi(\xi)\hat\varphi(\xi),$$

where $\hat{}$ denotes the Fourier transform. The operators Ψ^+, Ψ^-, Ψ^0 and $\tilde\Psi^0$ are defined as above with symbols ψ^+, ψ^-, ψ^0 and $\tilde\psi^0$, respectively.

By definition of ψ^+, ψ^-, ψ^0 and $\tilde\psi^0$, we have that $\Psi^{+*}\Psi^+ + \Psi^{-*}\Psi^- + \Psi^{0*}\Psi^0 = id$ and $\|[\Psi^+,\alpha]\varphi\|$, $\|[\Psi^-,\alpha]\varphi\|$, $\|[\Psi^0,\alpha]\varphi\|$ are estimated by $\|\tilde\Psi^0\varphi\|$, where $\alpha \in C^\infty$ and $\varphi \in C^\infty_c(U)$.

Finally, for $A \geq 0$ to be chosen later, we define the symbols $\psi^{\overset{\pm}{0}}_A(\xi) = \psi^{\overset{\pm}{0}}(\xi/(A+1))$, $\tilde\psi^0_A(\xi) = \tilde\psi^0(\xi/(A+1))$ and denote by $\Psi^{\overset{\pm}{0}}_A$, $\tilde\Psi^0_A$ the corresponding operators.

Lemma 3.1. *Let M be a CR manifold and $z_o \in M$. Then, there exists a neighborhood U of z_o such that for any $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, we have*

$$\|\tilde\Psi^0_A u\|^2 + Q_b(\zeta\Psi^0_A u, \zeta\Psi^0_A u) \underset{\sim}{>} \|\Psi^0_A u\|^2_1$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$, where ζ is a cut-off function such that $\zeta|_{supp\, u} \equiv 1$.

Proof. The proof of lemma is obtained by applying Theorem 2.1 once for $q_o = 0$ and a second time for $q_o = n-1$ and by using the estimate for symbols $|\sigma(T)| \underset{\sim}{<} \sum\limits_{j \leq n-1} (|\sigma(L_j)| + |\sigma(\bar L_j)|)$ in the elliptic region $\mathcal{C}^0$.

□

The following lemma is the analog of Lemma 4.12 and Lemma 4.13 in [N06].

Lemma 3.2. *Let M be a pseudoconvex CR manifold and and ϕ a real C^2 function. Then, for any sufficiently small set $U \subset M$ and any form $u \in \mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
(i) \qquad & \mathrm{Re}\Big(\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij}(c_{ij}T\zeta\Psi^+_A u_{iK}, \zeta\Psi^+_A u_{jK})_\phi\Big) \\
& \geq \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij}(Ac_{ij}\zeta\Psi^+_A u_{iK}, \zeta\Psi^+_A u_{jK})_\phi - c\|\zeta\Psi^+_A u\|^2_\phi - c_\phi\|\tilde\Psi^0_A u\|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

for any $k = 1, \dots, n-1$; and

$$\begin{aligned}
(ii) \qquad & \mathrm{Re}\Big(\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij}(c_{ij}T\zeta\Psi^-_A u_{iK}, \zeta\Psi^-_A u_{jK})_\phi - \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\sum_{j}(c_{jj}T\zeta\Psi^-_A u_J, \zeta\Psi^-_A u_J))_\phi\Big) \\
& \geq -\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij}(Ac_{ij}\zeta\Psi^-_A u_{iK}, \zeta\Psi^-_A u_{jK})_\phi + \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\sum_{j}(Ac_{jj}\zeta\Psi^-_A u_J, \zeta\Psi^-_A u_J))_\phi \\
& \quad - c\|\zeta\Psi^-_A u\|^2_\phi - c_\phi\|\tilde\Psi^0_A u\|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

for any $k = 0, \dots, n-2$, where $\zeta|_{supp\, u} = 1$; here c (resp. c_ϕ) is a positive constant independent (resp. dependent) of ϕ.

In combination with the basic estimate, Lemma 3.2 yields

Corollary 3.3. *Let $z_0 \in M$ and ϕ be a real C^∞ function. Then there exist a neighborhood U of z_0 and constants c and c_ϕ such that for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$*

$$\begin{aligned}(i) \qquad c_\phi\|\tilde{\Psi}^0_A u\|^2 + c\|\zeta\Psi^+_A u\|^2_\phi + \|\bar\partial_b\zeta\Psi^+_A u\|^2_\phi + \|\bar\partial^*_{b,\phi}\zeta\Psi^+_A u\|^2_\phi \\ \geq \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij}((\phi_{ij}+Ac_{ij})\zeta\Psi^+_A u_{iK}, \zeta\Psi^+_A u_{jK})_\phi\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

for any $k = 1, \dots, n-1$; and

$$\begin{aligned}(ii) \qquad c_\phi\|\tilde{\Psi}^0_A u\|^2 + c\|\zeta\Psi^-_A u\|^2_\phi + \|\bar\partial_b\zeta\Psi^-_A u\|^2_\phi + \|\bar\partial^*_{b,\phi}\zeta\Psi^-_A u\|^2_\phi \\ \geq \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij}((\phi_{ij}-Ac_{ij})\zeta\Psi^-_A u_{iK}, \zeta\Psi^-_A u_{jK})_\phi \\ - \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j}(\phi_{jj}-Ac_{jj}\zeta\Psi^-_A u_J, \zeta\Psi^-_A u_J))_\phi.\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

for any $k = 0, \dots, n-2$.

4. Global hypoellipticity for $\bar\partial_b$

Thoughout this section, we assume M endowed a nonnegative strictly CR-plurisubharmonic function λ in a neighborhood of M; then there is a constant $a \geq 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2}\big(\partial_b\bar\partial_b - \bar\partial_b\partial_b\big)\lambda + ad\gamma > 0. \tag{4.1}$$

From (4.1), we obtain

$$\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}+ac_{ij})u_{iK}\overline{u}_{jK} \gtrsim |u|^2 \tag{4.2}$$

for $k = 1, 2, \cdots, n-1$; and

$$\sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j}(\lambda_{jj}+ac_{jj})|u_J|^2 - \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij}(\lambda_{ij}+ac_{ij})u_{iK}\bar{u}_{jK} \gtrsim |u|^2. \tag{4.3}$$

for $k = 0, \cdots, n-2$.

We use Corollary 3.3 for $A = ta$. We choose $\phi = t\lambda$ combined with (4.2) on positive mircolocalization and $\phi = -t\lambda$ combined with (4.3) on negative mircolocalization. What we get is

Proposition 4.1. *Let M be a pseudoconvex CR manifold endowed with a strictly CR-plurisubharmonic function λ as in* (4.1)*. Then for any point $z_0 \in M$, there exist a neighborhood U of z_0 and constants c and c_t such that for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$*

$$(i) \qquad c_t\|\tilde{\Psi}^0_{ta}u\|^2 + \|\bar{\partial}_b\zeta\Psi^+_{ta}u\|^2_{t\lambda} + \|\bar{\partial}^*_{b,t\lambda}\zeta\Psi^+_{ta}u\|^2_{t\lambda} \underset{\sim}{>} t\|\Psi^+_{ta}u\|^2_{t\lambda} \tag{4.4}$$

for any $k = 1, \dots, n-1$; and

$$(ii) \qquad c_t\|\tilde{\Psi}^0_{ta}u\|^2 + \|\bar{\partial}_b\zeta\Psi^-_{ta}u\|^2_{-t\lambda} + \|\bar{\partial}^*_{b,-t\lambda}\zeta\Psi^-_{ta}u\|^2_{-t\lambda} \underset{\sim}{>} t\|\Psi^-_{ta}u\|^2_{-t\lambda} \tag{4.5}$$

for any $k = 0, \dots, n-2$.

In the following we define global norms from norms over local patches and give estimates on these norms.

For a choice of a partition of the unity $\{\zeta^0_\nu\}$ subordinate to a covering $\{U_\nu\}$, we set $u_\nu = \zeta^0_\nu u$. The global L_2-inner product and the global H^s-Sobolev norm for $u, v \in \mathcal{B}^k$ are defined by

$$(u,v) = \sum_\nu (\Psi^+u_\nu, \Psi^+v_\nu) + (\Psi^0u_\nu, \Psi^0v_\nu) + (\Psi^-u_\nu, \Psi^-v_\nu),$$

and

$$\|u\|^2_s = \sum_\nu \|T^s\Psi^+u_\nu\|^2 + \|\Lambda^s\Psi^0u_\nu\|^2 + \|T^s\Psi^-u_\nu\|^2.$$

It is natural to define the global weighted $L_{2,t}$-inner product and H^s_t-Sobolev norm by

$$\langle|u,v|\rangle_t = \sum_\nu (\Psi^+_{ta}u_\nu, \Psi^+_{ta}v_\nu)_{t\lambda} + (\Psi^0_{ta}u_\nu, \Psi^0_{ta}v_\nu) + (\Psi^-_{ta}u_\nu, \Psi^-_{ta}v_\nu)_{-t\lambda}, \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$\langle|u|\rangle^2_{t,s} = \sum_\nu \|T^s\Psi^+_{ta}u_\nu\|^2_{t\lambda} + \|\Lambda^s\Psi^0_{ta}u_\nu\|^2 + \|T^s\Psi^-_{ta}u_\nu\|^2_{-t\lambda}. \tag{4.7}$$

It is easy to check that $\langle|u,v|\rangle_0 \sim (u,v)$ and that there exist constants $c_{s,t}$ and $c'_{s,t}$ such that

$$c'_{s,t}\|u\|^2_s \leq \langle|u|\rangle^2_{t,s} \leq c_{s,t}\|u\|^2_s \text{ for any } u \in \mathcal{B}^k.$$

Let $\{\zeta_\nu\}$ be a sequence of cutoff functions such that for each ν, $\begin{cases}\zeta_\nu = 1 \text{ on } \mathrm{supp}\zeta^0_\nu,\\ \mathrm{supp}\zeta_\nu \subset U_\nu.\end{cases}$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle|\bar\partial_b u|\rangle^2_{t,0} =&\sum_\nu \|\Psi^+_{ta}\zeta^0_\nu\bar\partial u\|^2_{t\lambda} + \|\Psi^-_{ta}\zeta^0_\nu\bar\partial u\|^2_{-t\lambda} + \|\Psi^0_{ta}\zeta^0_\nu\bar\partial u\|^2\\ =&\sum_\nu \|\zeta_\nu\Psi^+_{ta}\zeta^0_\nu\bar\partial u\|^2_{t\lambda} + \|\zeta_\nu\Psi^-_{ta}\zeta^0_\nu\bar\partial u\|^2_{-t\lambda} + \|\zeta_\nu\Psi^0_{ta}\zeta^0_\nu\bar\partial u\|^2 + E(u)\\ =&\sum_\nu \|\bar\partial_b\zeta\Psi^+_{ta}u_\nu\|^2_{t\lambda} + \|\bar\partial_b\zeta\Psi^-_{ta}u_\nu\|^2_{-t\lambda} + \|\bar\partial_b\zeta\Psi^0_{ta}u_\nu\|^2 + E(u),\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

where $E(u)$ is an error term that can be estimated by

$$|E(u)| \lesssim \langle|u|\rangle^2_{t,0} + C_t\sum_\nu \|\tilde\Psi^0_{ta}\zeta_\nu u\|^2. \tag{4.9}$$

Let $\bar\partial^{*,t}_b$ be the adjoint of $\bar\partial_b$ with respect to $\langle|\cdot,\cdot|\rangle_{t,0}$. Similarly as for $\bar\partial_b$, we have

$$\langle|\bar\partial^{*,t}_b u|\rangle^2_{t,0} = \sum_\nu \|\bar\partial^*_{b,t\lambda}\zeta\Psi^+_{ta}u_\nu\|^2_{t\lambda} + \|\bar\partial^*_{b,-t\lambda}\zeta\Psi^-_{ta}u_\nu\|^2_{-t\lambda} + \|\bar\partial^*_b\zeta\Psi^0_{ta}u_\nu\|^2 + E(u). \tag{4.10}$$

We define

$$Q_b\langle|u,v|\rangle_t = \langle|\bar\partial_b u, \bar\partial_b v|\rangle_{t,0} + \langle|\bar\partial^{*,t}_b u, \bar\partial^{*,t}_b v|\rangle_{t,0}.$$

To control the term involving $\tilde\Psi$, we use Lemma 3.1 which yields

Lemma 4.2. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist a constant c_ϵ such that*

$$\sum_\nu \|\tilde\Psi^0_{ta}\zeta_\nu u\|^2 \le \epsilon(Q_b\langle|u,u|\rangle_t + \langle|u|\rangle^2_{t,0}) + c_\epsilon\langle|u|\rangle^2_{t,-1} \tag{4.11}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k$ with $0 \le k \le n-1$.

Combination of Proposition 4.1 with (4.8), (4.9), (4.10) and Lemma 4.2 yields

Proposition 4.3. *Let M be a pseudoconvex CR manifold of dimension $2n-1$ with $n \ge 3$ and endowed with a strictly CR-plurisubharmonic function. Then for any t suitably large there is a constant c_t such that*

$$c_t\langle|u|\rangle^2_{t,-1} + Q_b\langle|u,v|\rangle_t \gtrsim t\langle|u|\rangle^2_{t,0} \tag{4.12}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k$ with $1 \le k \le n-2$.

For $0 \le k \le n-1$, we define the space of harmonic k-forms $\mathcal{H}^k_t$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}^k_t =&\{u \in \mathcal{B}^k | \bar\partial_b u = 0 \text{ and } \bar\partial^{*,t}_b u = 0\}\\ =&\{u \in \mathcal{B}^k | Q_b\langle|u,u|\rangle_t = 0\}\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

On $\mathcal{H}_t^{k\perp}$, we define

$$\Box_{b,t} = \bar\partial_b \bar\partial_b^{*,t} + \bar\partial_b^{*,t}\bar\partial_b.$$

If the inverse of $\Box_{b,t}$ exists on $\mathcal{H}_t^{k\perp}$, we define the Green operator

$$G_{k,t} = \begin{cases} (\Box_{b,t})^{-1} & \text{on } \mathcal{H}_t^{k\perp} \\ 0 & \text{on } \mathcal{H}_t^{k}. \end{cases}$$

We carry on our discussion for the case $n \geq 3$. Since $L_{2,t}$ is compact in H_t^{-1}, Proposition 4.3 implies that there exists a constant c_t such that

$$\langle|u|\rangle_t^2 \leq c_t Q_b \langle|u,u|\rangle_t^2 \text{ for any } u \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial_b) \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial_b^{*,t}) \cap \mathcal{H}_t^{k\perp} \tag{4.14}$$

for $1 \leq k \leq n-2$. Thus, we have the following results:

(1) For $1 \leq k \leq n-2$, $\mathcal{H}_t^k$ is finite dimensional and its dimension is independent of t.
(2) The ranges of both $\bar\partial_b$ and $\bar\partial_b^{*,t}$ are closed on k-forms for $1 \leq k \leq n-2$. This also implies that $\bar\partial_b$ has closed range at the bottom degree $k=0$ and $\bar\partial_b^{*,t}$ at the top degree $k = n-1$.
(3) $\Box_{b,t}$ has closed range and $G_{k,t}$ exists and continuous on $\mathcal{H}_t^{k\perp}$ for any $k = 0, \cdots, n-1$.
(4) For $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, let $f \in \mathcal{B}^k$ satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \bar\partial_b f = 0 & \text{for } k \leq n-2 \\ f \perp \ker(\bar\partial_b^{*,t}) & \text{for } k = n-1. \end{cases}$$

Set $u_t = \bar\partial_b^{*,t} G_{k,t} f$, then u is a solution of equation $\bar\partial_b u = f$.

(5) For $0 \leq k \leq n-2$, let $f \in \mathcal{B}^k$ satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \bar\partial_b^{*,t} f = 0 & \text{for } k \geq 0 \\ f \perp \ker(\bar\partial_b) & \text{for } k = 0. \end{cases}$$

Set $u_t = \bar\partial_b G_{k,t} f$; then u is a solution of equation $\bar\partial_b^{*,t} u = f$.

Together with the above enumerated results, we also have

Proposition 4.4. *Let M be a pseudoconvex CR manifold of dimension $2n-1$ (with $n \geq 3$ and, in the case $n = 2$, with the extra assumption that $\bar\partial_b$ has closed range on functions) and endowed with a strictly CR-plurisubharmonic function. Then for any large t and for a suitable c_t we have for the two degrees $k = 0$ and $k = n-1$ which are missing in Proposition 4.3*

$$c_t \langle|u|\rangle_{t,-1}^2 + Q_b\langle|u,v|\rangle_t \underset{\sim}{>} t\langle|u|\rangle_{t,0}^2 \tag{4.15}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k \cap \mathcal{H}_t^{k\perp}$.

Proof.

Case 1, $n > 2$. Let f be smooth function orthogonal to $\ker(\bar\partial_b)$; as above, if we set $u_t = \bar\partial_b G_{0,t} f$ then $\bar\partial_b^{*,t} u_t = f$. Using the estimate (4.12) for the 1-form u_t, we get

$$\begin{aligned} t\langle|u_t|\rangle^2_{t,0} \lesssim&\langle|\bar\partial_b u_t|\rangle^2_{t,0} + \langle|\bar\partial_b^{*,t} u_t|\rangle^2_{t,0} + c_t\langle|u_t|\rangle^2_{t,-1} \\ \lesssim&\langle|f|\rangle^2_{t,0} + c_t\langle|f|\rangle^2_{t,-1} \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Hence, we have the estimate for f

$$\begin{aligned} t\langle|f|\rangle^2_{t,0} =&t\langle|f, \bar\partial_b^{*,t} u_t|\rangle_{t,0} = t\langle|\bar\partial_b f, u_t|\rangle_{t,0} \\ \le&C_\epsilon\langle|\bar\partial_b f|\rangle^2_{t,0} + \epsilon t^2\langle|u_t|\rangle^2_{t,0} \\ \le&C_\epsilon\langle|\bar\partial_b f|\rangle^2_{t,0} + \epsilon t\langle|f|\rangle^2_{t,0} + c_t\langle|f|\rangle^2_{t,-1} \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

For ϵ small, we obtain the L_2-norm estimate for any function $f \perp \ker(\bar\partial_b)$

$$t\langle|f|\rangle^2_{t,0} \lesssim\langle|\bar\partial_b f|\rangle^2_{t,0} + c_t\langle|f|\rangle^2_{t,-1}. \tag{4.18}$$

Case 2, $n = 2$. There is no estimate provided by Proposition 4.3. We observe that we have the estimate for postive microlocalization at degree 1 and negative microlocalization at degree 0. We prove how to get the estimate for postive microlocalization at degree 0. We use the extra assumption that $\bar\partial_b$ has closed range on functions. Thus the operator $\bar\partial^*_{b,t\lambda}\bar\partial_b$ has closed range on $\ker(\bar\partial_b)$ and we have $G_{0,t\lambda} = (\bar\partial^*_{b,t\lambda}\bar\partial_b)^{-1}$ on $\ker(\bar\partial_b)^\perp$.

Let f be a smooth function on $\ker(\bar\partial_b)^\perp$; we set $u_t = \bar\partial_b G_{0,t\lambda} f$; then $\bar\partial^*_{b,t\lambda} u_t = f$. The proof goes through in the same way as (4.16) and (4.17) with $\langle|\cdot,\cdot|\rangle$ replaced by $\sum_\nu(\Psi^+\zeta_\nu\cdot, \Psi^+\zeta_\nu\cdot)_{t\lambda}$ and we obtain

$$t\sum_\nu \|\Psi^+_{ta}\zeta_\nu f\|^2_{t\lambda} \lesssim \sum_\nu \|\bar\partial_b\Psi^+_{ta}\zeta_\nu f\|^2_{t\lambda} + c_t\sum_\nu \|\tilde\Psi^0_{ta}\zeta_\nu f\|^2_{t\lambda}. \tag{4.19}$$

Combination of (4.19) with Proposition 4.1 yields

$$t\langle|f|\rangle^2_t \lesssim \langle|\bar\partial_b f|\rangle^2_t + c_t\langle|f|\rangle^2_{-1,t} \text{ for any } f \perp \ker(\bar\partial_b). \tag{4.20}$$

The same argument applies to the case of top degree $k = n-1$ (both for $n \ge 3$ and $n = 2$).

$\Box$

One applies the L_2 estimate in (4.12) and (4.15) to the s-derivatives of u and controls error terms coming from commutators by the aid of a big constant t depending on s. In this way one obtains the proof of the theorem below about H^s-estimates for the system $(\bar\partial_b, \bar\partial_b^{*,t})$.

Theorem 4.5. *Let M be a pseudoconvex CR manifold of dimension $2n-1$ (where $n \ge 3$ and, in case $n = 2$, with the extra assumption that $\bar\partial_b$ has closed range on functions)* *and endowed with a strictly CR-plurisubharmonic function. Then, for any integer s there exists a constant T_s such that for any $t \geq T_s$, we have*

$$\langle|u|\rangle_{t,s}^2 \leq c_{t,s}(\langle|\bar\partial_b u|\rangle_{t,s}^2 + \langle|\bar\partial_b^{*,t} u|\rangle_{t,s}^2) \tag{4.21}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k \cap \mathcal{H}_t^k$ with $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ where $c_{t,s}$ is a constant depending on t ad s.

Also, an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.5 is the proof of Theorem 1.2 for whose completion only minor details must be clarified.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By the method of the elliptic regularization one passes from a priori estimates (4.21) to actual estimates and obtains H^s solvability. By an approximation argument, one obtains a C^∞ solution as a sum of a convergent series $u = \sum_s(u_{s+1} - u_s)$ (s integer). The proof of Theorem 1.2 is complete.

□

The following corollary to Theorem 4.5 is one key ingredient for the proof of Theorem 1.5 in Section 6 below.

Corollary 4.6. *Under the hypothesis in Theorem 1.2, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Psi^+ T^s \bar\partial_b^{*,t} G_{k,t} u\|^2 &\lesssim \|\Psi^+ T^s u\|^2 + \|\tilde\Psi^0 \Lambda^s u\|^2,\\
\|\Psi^+ T^s \bar\partial G_{k,t} u\|^2 &\lesssim \|\Psi^+ T^s u\|^2 + \|\tilde\Psi^0 \Lambda^s u\|^2,\\
\|\Psi^- T^s \bar\partial_b^{*,t} G_{k,t} u\|^2 &\lesssim \|\Psi^- T^s u\|^2 + \|\tilde\Psi^0 \Lambda^s u\|^2,\\
\|\Psi^- T^s \bar\partial G_{k,t} u\|^2 &\lesssim \|\Psi^- T^s u\|^2 + \|\tilde\Psi^0 \Lambda^s u\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k$.

5. The Straube-Boas formula for Green operators

In this section, we shall show the expression of the Green operator by Szego projection and anti-Szego-projection (similar as to Straube-Boas formula in [BS90] for the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator).

From Proposition 4.4, the operator $\bar\partial_b$ has closed range on k-forms for $0 \leq k \leq n-2$. Thus $\bar\partial_b^*$ (the unweighted adjoint of $\bar\partial_b$) has also closed range on k-forms for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. This implies

$$\|u\|^2 \lesssim \|\bar\partial_b u\|^2 + \|\bar\partial_b^* u\|^2 \tag{5.1}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k \cap \mathcal{H}^{k\perp}$ and the Green operator G_k exists and is L_2 continuous for any $k = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$. Let S_k be the Szego projection, the operator that projects L_2^k to the space of holomorphic k-forms $\{u \in Dom(\bar\partial) \cap L_2^k | \bar\partial u = 0\}$. By Kohn's formula we have

$$S_k = \begin{cases} I - \bar\partial_b^* G_{k+1} \bar\partial_b & \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq n-2,\\ I & \text{for } k = n-1. \end{cases}$$

Let A_t be the operator defined by

$$(A_t u, v) = \langle |u, v|\rangle_t.$$

Denote A_t^{-1} be the inverse of A_t. Notice that both A_t and A_t^{-1} are self-adjoint in L_2. Define

$$\begin{aligned} M_k &= (I - S_k)\bar\partial_b^{*,t} G_{k+1,t} S_{k+1} A_t G_{k,t} \bar\partial_b A_t^{-1}(I - S_k) \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, ..., n-2,\\ N_k &= S_k A_t G_{k,t} \bar\partial_b A_t^{-1}(I - S_{k-1})\bar\partial_b^{*,t} G_{k,t} S_k \qquad\qquad \text{for } k = 1, ..., n-1. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Theorem 5.1. *There exists $T_0 \geq 0$ such that for any $t \geq T_0$ the following equalities hold*

$$G_k = \begin{cases} M_k & \text{for } k = 0,\\ M_k + N_k & \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq n-2,\\ N_k & \text{for } k = n-1. \end{cases} \tag{5.3}$$

Proof. We only prove the theorem in the cases $1 \leq k \leq n-2$, the proof of the cases $k = 0$ and $k = n-1$ being similar.

For $1 \leq k \leq n-2$, since

$$\begin{aligned} G_k =& G_k(\bar\partial_b \bar\partial_b^* + \bar\partial_b^* \bar\partial_b) G_k = (G_k \bar\partial)(\bar\partial^* G_k) + (\bar\partial^* G_{k+1})(G_{k+1}\bar\partial)\\ =&(\bar\partial^* G_k)^*(\bar\partial^* G_k) + (\bar\partial^* G_{k+1})(\bar\partial^* G_{k+1})^* \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

it suffices to write $\bar\partial_b^* G_k$ and $\bar\partial_b^* G_{k+1}$ in terms of Szego projections.

Let $g \in B^k$ and set $f = S_k g$; then g is a $\bar\partial_b$-closed form. By Theorem 1.2 there exists a constant t (sufficientlty large) such that $u = \bar\partial_b^{*,t} G_{k,t} f \in \mathcal{B}^{k-1}$ is a solution of equation $\bar\partial_b u = f$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} (I - S_{k-1})\bar\partial_b^{*,t} G_{k,t} S_k g &= \bar\partial_b^* G_k \bar\partial_b \bar\partial_b^{*,t} G_{k,t} \bar\partial_b u\\ &= \bar\partial_b^* G_k \bar\partial_b u = \bar\partial_b^* G_k S_k g = \bar\partial_b^* G_k g. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (u, G_k \bar\partial_b v) &= (\bar\partial_b^* G_k u, v)\\ &= ((I - S_{k-1})\bar\partial_b^{*,t} G_{k,t} S_k u, v)\\ &= (\bar\partial_b^{*,t} G_{k,t} S_k u, (I - S_{k-1} v)\\ &= \langle |\bar\partial_b^{*,t} G_{k,t} S_k u, A_t^{-1}(I - S_{k-1})v|\rangle\\ &= \langle |S_k u, G_{k,t} \bar\partial_b A_t^{-1}(I - S_{k-1})v|\rangle\\ &= (u, S_k A_t G_{k,t} \bar\partial_b A_t^{-1}(I - S_{k-1})v) \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k(U); v \in \mathcal{B}^{k-1}(U)$.

Therefore, we obtain the equalities

$$\begin{cases} \bar\partial_b^* G_k & = (I - S_{k-1})\bar\partial_b^{*,t} G_{k,t} S_k, \\ G_k \bar\partial_b & = S_k A_t G_{k,t} \bar\partial_b A_t^{-1} (I - S_{k-1}). \end{cases} \tag{5.7}$$

Combining (5.4) and (5.7) we get the proof of Theorem 5.1.

$\square$

Similarly, we define the anti-Szego-projection

$$R_k = \begin{cases} I - \bar\partial_b G_{k-1} \bar\partial_b^* & \text{for } 1 \le k \le n-1, \\ I & \text{for } k = 0. \end{cases}$$

We can check that this operator projects L_2^k to the space of anti-holomorphic forms $\{u \in Dom(\bar\partial) \cap L_2^k | \bar\partial^* u = 0\}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} P_k &= R_k \bar\partial_b^{*,t} G_{k+1,t}(I - R_{k+1}) A_t G_{k,t} \bar\partial_b A_t^{-1} R_k \qquad &\text{for } k = 0, 1, ..., n-2, \\ Q_k &= (I - R_k) A_t G_{k,t} \bar\partial_b A_t^{-1} R_{k-1} \bar\partial_b^{*,t} G_{k,t} (I - R_k) \qquad &\text{for } k = 1, ..., n-1. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Theorem 5.2. *For large t the following equalities hold*

$$G_k = \begin{cases} P_k & \text{for } k = 0, \\ P_k + Q_k & \text{for } 1 \le k \le n-2, \\ Q_k & \text{for } k = n-1. \end{cases} \tag{5.9}$$

Proof. The proof of this Theorem is entirely analogous to the case of the Szego projection.

$\square$

6. θ-COMPACTNESS ESTIMATES

Let $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1})$ be a vector field. We define the operator $\bar\Theta : \mathcal{B}^k \to \mathcal{B}^{k+1}$ by

$$\bar\Theta u = \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_i \bar\theta_j u_J \bar\omega_j \wedge \bar\omega_K. \tag{6.1}$$

We denote by $\bar\Theta^* : \mathcal{B}^{k+1} \to \mathcal{B}^k$ the L_2-adjoint of $\bar\Theta$, that is

$$\bar\Theta^* u = \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_i \theta_j u_{jK} \bar\omega_K. \tag{6.2}$$

Notice that $|\bar\Theta^* u|$ coincides with $|\theta u|$ formerly defined.

We define now "microlocalized θ-compactness estimates".

Definition 6.1. A θ-compactness estimate is said to hold for $\Box_b$ on positively (resp. negatively) microlocalized k-forms at z_0 if there exists a neigborhood U of z_0 such that for any ϵ and suitable c_ϵ we have

$$(\theta - C)^k_+ \qquad \|\bar{\Theta}^*\zeta\Psi^+u\|^2 \le \epsilon(\|\bar\partial_b\zeta\Psi^+u\|^2 + \|\bar\partial_b^*\zeta\Psi^+u\|^2) + c_\epsilon\|\tilde{\Psi}^0u\|^2_{-1}, \tag{6.3}$$

(resp.

$$(\theta - C)^k_- \qquad \|\bar{\Theta}\zeta\Psi^-u\|^2 \le \epsilon(\|\bar\partial_b\zeta\Psi^-u\|^2 + \|\bar\partial_b^*\zeta\Psi^-u\|^2) + c_\epsilon\|\tilde{\Psi}^0u\|^2_{-1}.) \tag{6.4}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$ such that $\zeta|_{\operatorname{supp} u} \equiv 1$.

Positively and negatively microlocalized estimates are related, in complementary degree, by the aid of the star-Hodge theory.

Proposition 6.2. *We have that $(\theta - C)^k_-$ is equivalent to $(\theta - C)^{n-1-k}_+$.*

Proof. We define the local conjugate-linear duality map $F^k : \mathcal{B}^k \to \mathcal{B}^{n-1-k}$ as follows. If $u = \sum'_{|J|=k} u_J\bar\omega_J$ then

$$F^k u = \sum \epsilon^{\{J,J'\}}_{\{1,\dots,n-1\}} \bar{u}_J \bar\omega_{J'},$$

where J' denotes the strictly increasing $(n-k-1)$-tuple consisting of all integers in $[1, n-1]$ which do not belong to J and $\epsilon^{J,J'}_{\{1,n-1\}}$ is the sign of the permutation $\{J, J'\} \overset{\sim}{\to} \{1,\dots,n-1\}$.

Since $\overline{\zeta\Psi^+u} = \zeta\Psi^-\overline{u}$, then

$$F^k\zeta\Psi^+u = \sum \epsilon^{\{J,J'\}}_{\{1,\dots,n-1\}} \zeta\Psi^-\bar{u}_J\bar\omega_{J'}.$$

Also, $F^{n-1-k}F^k\zeta\Psi^+u = \zeta\Psi^+u$; $\|F^k\zeta\Psi^+u\| = \|\zeta\Psi^-u\|$;

$$\begin{cases} \bar\partial_b F^k\zeta\Psi^+u = F^{k-1}\bar\partial_b^*\zeta\Psi^-u + \cdots \\ \bar\partial_b^* F^k\zeta\Psi^+u = F^{k+1}\bar\partial_b\zeta\Psi^-u + \cdots \end{cases}$$

where dots refers the term in which u is not differentiated; and finally

$$\begin{cases} \bar\Theta F^k\zeta\Psi^+u = F^{k-1}\bar\Theta^*\zeta\Psi^-u \\ \bar\Theta^* F^k\zeta\Psi^+u = F^{k+1}\bar\Theta\zeta\Psi^-u. \end{cases}$$

Thus we obtain the proof of Proposition 6.2.

$\Box$

We also remark that if a positively (resp. negatively) microlocalized θ-compactness estimate holds on q-forms, then it also holds in higher (resp. lower) degree of forms.

Proposition 6.3. *Let M be CR manifold; then*

(i) *$(\theta - C)^q_+$ implies $(\theta - C)^k_+$ for any $k \ge q$.*
(ii) *$(\theta - C)^q_-$ implies $(\theta - C)^k_-$ for any $k \le q$.*

Proof. We first discuss the positive mircolocalization case; in particular we only need to show that $(\theta-C)^k_+$ implies $(\theta-C)^{k+1}_+$. Let $u=\sum'_{|L|=k+1}u_L\bar\omega_L$ have degree $k+1$. We rewrite u as a non-ordered sum

$$u=\frac{1}{(k+1)!}\sum_{|L|=k+1}u_L\bar\omega_L=\frac{(-1)^k}{k+1}\sum_{l=1}^{n-1}\Big(\frac{1}{k!}\sum_{|J|=k}u_{lJ}\bar\omega_J\Big)\wedge\bar\omega_l.$$

For $l=1,\dots,n-1$, we define a set of k-forms v_l by $v_l:=\sum'_{|J|=k}u_{lJ}\bar\omega_J$. It is easy to see that $\sum_{l=1}^{n-1}|v_l|^2=(k+1)|u|^2$ and $\sum_{l=1}^{n-1}\sum'_{|K|=k-1}c_{ij}T(v_l)_{iK}\overline{(v_l)}_{jK}=k\sum'_{|J|=k}c_{ij}Tu_{iJ}\bar u_{jJ}$ for each pair (i,j).

Using (2.24) for the case $\phi=0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{l=1}^{n}Q(\zeta\Psi^+v_l,\zeta\Psi^+v_l)&\le\sum_{l=1}^{n}\Big(\frac32\sum_{j=1}^{n}\|\bar L_j\zeta\Psi^+v_l\|^2+\sum_{ij}\sum'_{|K|=k-1}(c_{ij}T(\zeta\Psi^+v_l)_{iK},(\zeta\Psi^+v_l)_{jK})+c\|\zeta\Psi^+v_l\|^2\Big)\\&=(k+1)\Big(\frac32\sum_{j=1}^{n}\|\bar L_j\zeta\Psi^+u\|^2+c\|\zeta\Psi^+u\|^2\Big)+k\sum'_{|J|=k}\sum_{ij}(c_{ij}T\zeta\Psi^+u_{iJ},\zeta\Psi^+u_{jJ})\\&\le\frac34(k+1)\Big(\frac12\sum_{j=1}^{n}\|\bar L_j\zeta\Psi^+u\|^2+\sum'_{|J|=k}\sum_{ij}(c_{ij}T\zeta\Psi^+u_{iJ},\zeta\Psi^+u_{jJ})\Big)\\&\quad+c\|\zeta\Psi^+u\|^2+c'\|\tilde\Psi^0u\|^2\\&\le\frac34(k+1)Q(\zeta\Psi^+u,\zeta\Psi^+u)+c\|\zeta\Psi^+u\|^2+c'\|\tilde\Psi^0u\|^2\end{aligned}\tag{6.5}$$

where c and c' are constants (different in each line). Here the second inequality follows from Lemma 3.2 and the last one from Theorem 2.1. Moreover, we have

$$\sum_{l=1}^{n-1}|\bar\Theta^*v_l|^2=k|\bar\Theta^*u|.$$

This concludes the proof of the positively mircolocalized case.

We discuss now the negatively microlocalized case. Let $u=\sum'_{|K|=k-1}u_K\bar\omega_K$ have degree $k-1$. For l=1,...,n, define $v_l=\sum'_{|K|=k-1}u_K\bar\omega_K\wedge\bar\omega_l$; this has degree k. Then the proof follows the same lines as in the positive microlocalization case.

$\square$

We prove now the θ-compactness estimate (6.3) and (6.4) when Property $(\theta-P_q)$ holds.

Proposition 6.4. *Let M be a pseudoconvex CR manifold. Assume that property $(\theta - P_q)$ holds at z_o. Then*

- (i) *A θ-compactness estimate on positively microlocalized k forms $(\theta - C)^k_+$ holds for any $k \geq q$.*
- (ii) *A θ-compactness estimate on negatively microlocalized k forms $(\theta - C)^k_-$ holds for any $k \leq n-1-q$.*

Proof. (i) We assume that we have family ϕ^ϵ with properties

$$\begin{cases} |\phi^\epsilon| \leq 1 \\ \epsilon \sideset{}{'}\sum\limits_{|K|=q} \sum_{ij} \phi^\epsilon_{ij} u_{iK} \bar{u}_{jK} \geq |\theta u|^2; \end{cases} \tag{6.6}$$

and we first show that $(\theta - C)^q_+$ holds.

We will apply the first inequality of Corollary 3.3 for $A = 0$ and $\phi = \chi(\phi^\epsilon)$ where χ is a function to be chosen later. First, we notice that

$$(\chi(\phi^\epsilon))_{ij} = \dot{\chi}\phi^\epsilon_{ij} + \ddot{\chi}|\phi_j|^2\kappa_{ij}, \tag{6.7}$$

(where κ_{ij} is the Kronecker symbol) and

$$|\bar\partial^*_{b,\phi} u|^2 \leq \quad 2|\bar\partial^*_b u|^2 + 2\dot{\chi}^2 \sideset{}{'}\sum\limits_{|K|=k-1} |\textstyle\sum_j \phi_j u_{jK}|^2. \tag{6.8}$$

Thus we get from (6.9) and taking into account (6.7) and (6.8)

$$\begin{aligned} &C_\epsilon\|\tilde\Psi^0 u\|^2 + c\|\zeta\Psi^+ u\|^2_{\chi(\phi^\epsilon)} + \|\bar\partial_b\zeta\Psi^+ u\|^2_{\chi(\phi^\epsilon)} + 2\|\bar\partial^*_b\zeta\Psi^+ u\|^2_{\chi(\phi^\epsilon)} \\ &\geq \int_M \dot\chi e^{-\chi(\phi^\epsilon)}\phi_{ij}\zeta\Psi^+ u_{iK}\overline{\zeta\Psi^+ u_{jK}}dV + \int_M (\ddot\chi - 2\dot\chi^2)e^{-\chi(\phi^\epsilon)} \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1} |\sum_j \phi_j\zeta\Psi^+ u_{jK}|^2 dV. \end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

We choose χ such that $\ddot\chi \geq 2\dot\chi^2$ for $t < 1$ (for example: $\chi(t) = \frac{1}{2}e^{t-1}$). Combination of (6.6) and (6.9) yields $(\theta - C)^q_+$. Next, by Propostion 6.3 we obtain $(\theta - C)^k_+$ for any $k \geq q$.

(ii) is a consequence of (i) in addition to Proposition 6.2.

$\square$

7. GLOBAL HYPOELLIPTICITY FOR $\Box_b$

We write the commutator $[L_j, T]$ as

$$[L_j, T] = \theta_j T + V_j \ \text{ where } V_j \text{ are error terms in } T^{1,0}M \oplus T^{0,1}M.$$

Associated to the vector-operator $(\theta_j T)_j$ there are the operators $\bar\Theta$ and $\bar\Theta^*$ defined by (6.1) and (6.2). Using the vector-operator $(V_j)_j$ above defined, we introduce

$$\bar{\mathcal{V}}u = \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\sum_{j\le n-1} \bar V_j u_J \bar\omega_j \wedge \bar\omega_J,$$

and its adjoint

$$\bar{\mathcal{V}}^* u = \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{j\le n-1} V_j u_{jK} \bar\omega_K.$$

We have, in other words

$$\begin{cases} [\bar\partial_b, T] = \bar\Theta T + \bar{\mathcal{V}}, \\ [\bar\partial_b^*, T] = \bar\Theta^* T + \bar{\mathcal{V}}^*. \end{cases} \tag{7.1}$$

By induction, we get the equalities on higher power of T

$$\begin{cases} [\bar\partial_b, T^s] = s\bar\Theta T^s + \sum_{m=0}^{s-1} a_m T^m \bar{\mathcal{V}}, \\ [\bar\partial_b^*, T^s] = s\bar\Theta^* T^s + \sum_{m=0}^{s-1} b_m T^m \bar{\mathcal{V}}^*. \end{cases} \tag{7.2}$$

If we consider Kohn's microlocalization, we have

$$\begin{cases} [\bar\partial, (\Psi^+ T^s)^*(\Psi^+ T^s)]u = (\Psi^+ T^s)^* \Big(2s\zeta\bar\Theta\Psi^+ T^s u + \text{good}^+ u \Big) \\ [\bar\partial^*, (\Psi^- T^s)^*(\Psi^- T^s)]u = (\Psi^- T^s)^* \Big(2s\zeta\bar\Theta^*\Psi^- T^s u + \text{good}^- u \Big) \end{cases} \tag{7.3}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$, where $\zeta \in C^\infty_c(U)$ is a cut-off function such that $\zeta|_{\operatorname{supp} u} \equiv 1$ and "good$^\pm$" denotes a term which satisfies

$$\|\text{good}^\pm u\|^2 \lesssim \|\Psi^\pm T^{s-1} \bar{\mathcal{V}} u\|^2 + \|\Psi^\pm T^{s-1} \bar{\mathcal{V}}^* u\|^2 + \|\tilde\Psi^0 u\|^2_s \tag{7.4}$$

This is just a consequence of (7.2) by the aid of Jacobi identity. Now, we claim that the first term in the right hand side of (7.4) can be estimated as

$$\|\Psi^\pm T^{s-1}\bar{\mathcal{V}}u\|^2 + \|\Psi^\pm T^{s-1}\bar{\mathcal{V}}^*u\|^2 \lesssim \|\Psi^\pm T^{s-1}\bar\partial_b u\|^2 + \|\Psi^\pm T^{s-1}\bar\partial_b u\|^2 + \|\Psi^\pm T^s u\| (\|\Psi^\pm T^{s-1}u\| + \|\tilde\Psi^0 u\|_s),$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$. In fact, using twice Theorem 2.1 for $q_o = 0$ and $q_o = n-1$ and taking summation, we get

$$\|\bar{\mathcal{V}}u\|^2 + \|\bar{\mathcal{V}}^*u\|^2 \lesssim \|\bar\partial_b u\|^2 + \|\bar\partial_b^* u\| + \|Tu\|\|u\| \tag{7.5}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$. Replacing u in (7.5) by $\Psi^\pm T^{s-1}u$, we get the proof of the claim. We are ready for the central result

Theorem 7.1. *Let q be an index $1 \le q \le n-1$. Assume that property $(\theta - P_q)$ holds at z_o and that M is endowed with a strictly CR-plurisubharmonic function; then there exists a neigborhood U of z_o such that*

$$\|\Psi^+ T^s S_{k-1} u\|^2 \lesssim \|\Psi^+ T^s u\|^2 + \|\tilde\Psi^0 u\|^2_s \tag{7.6}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^{k-1}_c(U)$ *with* $k \geq q$*, where* $s \geq 0$ *is integer . Moreover, we have*

$$\|\Psi^+T^sG_ku\|^2 \lesssim \|\Psi^+T^su\|^2 + \|\tilde{\Psi}^0u\|^2_s \tag{7.7}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$ *with* $k \geq q$*.*

Proof. We want to use induction on $k = n, \dots, q$. We start on $n-1$ forms; since $S_{n-1} = I$, then (7.6) trivially holds.

Now, we assume by induction that (7.6) holds on $(0,k)$-forms. Since $k < n$, we use Kohn's formula for Szego projection $S_{k-1} = I - \bar\partial_b^* G_k \bar\partial_b$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Psi^+T^sS_{k-1}u\|^2 =&(\Psi^+T^sS_{k-1}u, \Psi^+T^su) - (\Psi^+T^sS_{k-1}u, \Psi^+T^s\bar\partial_b^*G_k\bar\partial_bu)\\ =&(\Psi^+T^sS_{k-1}u, \Psi^+T^su) - ((\Psi^+T^s)^*\Psi^+T^s\bar\partial_bS_{k-1}u, G_k\bar\partial_bu)\\ &+ ([\bar\partial_b, (\Psi^+T^s)^*\Psi^+T^s]S_{k-1}u, G_k\bar\partial_bu)\end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

We describe how to estimate the second two lines. The first term is controlled by the "small/large constant" argument. The second is 0. Hence we only need to estimate the last term. By (7.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}([\bar\partial_b, (\Psi^+T^s)^*\Psi^+T^s]S_{k-1}u, G_k\bar\partial_bu) =&2s(\Psi^+T^sS_{k-1}u, \bar\Theta^*\zeta\Psi^+T^sG_k\bar\partial_bu)\\ &+ (\text{good}^+S_{k-1}u, \Psi^+T^sG_k\bar\partial_bu)\\ \leq&\epsilon(\|\Psi^+T^sG_k\bar\partial_bu\|^2 + \|\Psi^+T^sS_{k-1}u\|^2)\\ &+ c_\epsilon(\|\text{good}^+S_{k-1}u\|^2 + \|\bar\Theta^*\zeta\Psi^+T^sG_k\bar\partial_bu\|^2).\end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

To estimate the first term in the last line of (7.9), we combine (7.4) and Proposition 7.4. We obtain:

$$\|\text{good}^+S_{k-1}u\|^2 \lesssim \epsilon\|\Psi^+T^sS_{k-1}u\|^2 + c_\epsilon\text{admissible}, \tag{7.10}$$

where "admissible" stands for a term of type $\|\Psi^+T^su\|^2 + \|\tilde\Psi^0u\|^2_s + \|\Psi^+T^{s-1}S_{k-1}u\|^2$ and where ϵ and c_ϵ are possibly new constants.

For the second one in the last line of (7.9), we use the hypothesis of the theorem, apply Proposition 6.4 (i) and use the $(\theta - C)^k_+$ estimate in degree $k \geq q$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar\Theta^*\zeta\Psi^+T^sG_k\bar\partial_bu\|^2 \leq&\epsilon(\|\bar\partial_b\zeta\Psi^+T^sG_k\bar\partial_bu\|^2 + \|\bar\partial_b^*\zeta\Psi^+T^sG_k\bar\partial_bu\|) + c_\epsilon\|\Psi^0T^sG_k\bar\partial_bu\|^2\\ \leq&\epsilon(\|\Psi^+T^sG_k\bar\partial_bu\|^2 + \|\Psi^+T^sS_{k-1}u\|^2) + c_\epsilon\text{admissible}.\end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

Combination of (7.8),(7.9),(7.10) and (7.11) yields

$$\|\Psi^+T^sS_{k-1}u\|^2 \leq \epsilon\|\Psi^+T^sG_k\bar\partial_bu\|^2 + c_\epsilon\text{admissible}. \tag{7.12}$$

We apply now Theorem 5.1

$$G_k\bar\partial_bu = S_kA_tG_{k,t}\bar\partial_bA_t^{-1}(I - S_{k-1})u.$$

We then get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\Psi^+T^sG_k\bar\partial_b u\|^2 =&\|\Psi^+T^sS_kA_tG_{k,t}\bar\partial_bA_t^{-1}(I-S_{k-1})u\|^2\\
\le& C_s\|\Psi^+T^sA_tG_{k,t}\bar\partial_bA_t^{-1}(I-S_{k-1})u\|^2+\text{admissible}\\
\le& C_s\|\Psi^+T^s(I-S_{k-1})u\|^2+\text{admissible}\\
\le& C_s\|\Psi^+T^sS_{k-1}u\|^2+\text{admissible.}
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.13}
$$

Here the first inequality follows from the inductive hypothesis and the second one from Corollary 4.6. Combination of (7.12) and (7.13) yields the regularity of S_{k-1} which concludes the proof of inequality (7.6).

The proof of the second inequality, that is (7.7), is immediate consequence of Corollary 4.6, Theorem 5.1 and the first inequality, that is (7.6), in both cases $n=2$ or $n\ge 3$. □

Using the anti-Szego-projection and induction over increasing degree starting from 0 degree, we obtain a perfectly symmetric statement for the negative microlocalization.

Theorem 7.2. *Let q be an index $1\le q\le n-1$. Assume that property $(\theta-P_q)$ holds at z_o and M is endowed with a strictly CR-plurisubharmonic function; then there exists a neigborhood U of z_o such that*

$$\|\Psi^-T^sR_ku\|^2 \lesssim \|\Psi^-T^su\|^2+\|\tilde\Psi^0u\|^2_s \tag{7.14}$$

for any $u\in\mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$ with $k\le n-q$, where $s\ge 0$ is integer . Moreover, we have

$$\|\Psi^-T^sG_ku\|^2 \lesssim \|\Psi^-T^su\|^2+\|\tilde\Psi^0u\|^2_s \tag{7.15}$$

for any $u\in\mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$ with $k\le n-q-1$.

Corollary 7.3. *Let q be an index $1\le q\le \frac{n-1}{2}$. Assume that Property $(\theta-P_q)$ holds at z_o and M is endowed with a strictly CR-plurisubharmonic function; then there exists a neighborhood U of z_o such that*

$$\|G_ku\|^2_s \lesssim \|u\|^2_s \tag{7.16}$$

for any $u\in\mathcal{B}^k_c(U)$ with $q\le k\le n-q-1$.

Proof. This is just a combination of Theorem 7.1 for Ψ^+u, Theorem 7.2 for Ψ^-u and Lemma 3.1 for Ψ^0u.

□

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let $u \in \mathcal{B}^k$ and $\{\zeta_\nu\}$ be a partition of the unity subordinate to the covering $\{U_\nu\}$ of M satisfying $\sum\limits_\nu \zeta_\nu = 1$. Using Corollary 7.3 on each U_ν, we get.

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_k u\|_s = \|G_k \sum_\nu \zeta_\nu u\|_s \lesssim \sum_\nu \|G_k \zeta_\nu u\|_s \\ \lesssim \sum_\nu \|\zeta_\nu u\|_s \lesssim \|u\|_s. \end{aligned} \tag{7.17}$$

Using the method of elliptic regularization as in [FK72] the a priori estimate (7.17) becomes an actual estimate in H^s which yields the conclusion of the proof of Theorem 1.5. □

APPENDIX

The following is the Hodge decomposition theorem for $\bar\partial_b$.

Theorem 7.4. *Let M be the CR manifold of dimension $2n-1$ with $n \geq 2$. Assume that $\bar\partial_b$ has closed range on k-forms with $0 \leq k \leq n-2$. Then for any $0 \leq k \leq n-1$, there exists a linear operator $G_k : L^2(M) \to L^2(M)$ such that*

1. *G_k is bounded and $\mathcal{R}(G_k) \subset Dom(\Box_b)$.*
2. *We have*

$$S_k = \begin{cases} I - \bar\partial_b^* G_{k+1} \bar\partial_b & \text{for } 0 \leq k \leq n-2, \\ I & \text{for } k = n-1, \end{cases}$$

$$R_k = \begin{cases} I - \bar\partial_b G_{k-1} \bar\partial_b^* & \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq n-1, \\ I & \text{for } k = 0. \end{cases}$$

3. *For any L_2 form α of degree k, we have*

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} \bar\partial_b \bar\partial_b^* G_k \alpha \oplus \bar\partial_b^* \bar\partial_b G_k \alpha & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq n-2, \\ \bar\partial_b^* \bar\partial_b G_k \alpha \oplus S_k \alpha & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \bar\partial_b \bar\partial_b^* G_k \alpha \oplus R_k \alpha & \text{if } k = n-1. \end{cases}$$

4. *If $1 \leq k \leq n-2$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} G_k \Box_b = \Box_b G_k = I &\quad \text{on } \; Dom(\Box_b), \\ \bar\partial_b G_k = G_{k+1} \bar\partial_b &\quad \text{on } \; Dom(\bar\partial_b), \\ \bar\partial_b^* G_k = G_{k-1} \bar\partial_b^* &\quad \text{on } \; Dom(\bar\partial_b^*), \\ S_k + R_k = I. & \end{aligned}$$

5. *We have*

$$G_0 = \bar\partial_b^* G_1^2 \bar\partial_b \text{ and } G_{n-1} = \bar\partial_b G_{n-2}^2 \bar\partial_b^*.$$

References

[BS90] **H. P. Boas and E. J. Straube**—Equivalence of regularity for the Bergman projection and the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann operator, *manuscripta math.* **67**, (1990), 25–33

[BS91] **H. P. Boas and E. J. Straube**—Sobolev estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann operator on domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$ admitting a defining function that is plurisubharmonic on the boundary, *Math. Z.* **206** **(1)** (1991) 81–88

[C84] **D. Catlin**—Global regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem. *Complex analysis of several variables* (Madison, Wis., 1982),*Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.,* **41**, (1984), 39–49

[FK72] **G. B. Folland and J. J. Kohn**—The Neumann problem for the Cauchy-Riemann complex, *Ann. Math. Studies, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton N.J.* **75** (1972).

[FS98] **S. Fu and E. J. Straube**—Compactness of the $\overline{\partial}$-Neumann problem on convex domains. *J. Funct. Anal.* 159 (1998), no. **2**, 629–641

[FS01] **S. Fu and E. J. Straube**— Compactness in the $\overline{\partial}$-Neumann problem.*Complex analysis and geometry* (Columbus, OH, 1999), *Ohio State Univ. Math. Res. Inst. Publ.*,**9**, de Gruyter, Berlin,(2001) , 141–160

[G] **Grauert**— Bemerkenswerte pseudokonvexe Mannigfaltigkeiten, *Math. Z.* 81 (1963), 377–391.

[Kh10] **T.V. Khanh**—A general method of weights in the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem, (2010) arxiv:1001.5093

[KZ09a] **T. V. Khanh and G. Zampieri**—Compactness of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann operator on a q-pseudoconvex domain, to appear in *Complex Variables and Eliptic Equations* (2009)

[K73] **J. J. Kohn**—Global regularity for $\bar{\partial}$ on weakly pseudo-convex manifolds, *Trans. of the A.M.S.* **181** (1973), 273–292

[K84] **J. J. Kohn**—Microlocalization of CR structures, *Proc. Several Complex Variables* (Hangzhou, 1981), Birkhauser, Boston, 1984, 29–36

[K85] **J. J. Kohn**–Estimates for $\bar{\partial}_b$ on pseudoconvex CR manifolds, *Proc. of Symposia on Pure Math.* **43** (1985), 207–217

[K86] **J. J. Kohn**—The range of the tangential Cauchy-Riemann operator, *Duke Math. J.* **53** (1986), 525–545

[K02] **J. J. Kohn**—Superlogarithmic estimates on pseudoconvex domains and CR manifolds, *Annals of Math.***156** (2002), 213–248

[KN06] **J.J. Kohn and A. Nicoara**—The $\bar{\partial}_b$ equation on weakly pseudoconvex CR manifolds of dimension 3, *J. Funct. Analysis* **230** (2006), 251–272

[McN02] **J. D. McNeal**— A sufficient condition for compactness of the $\overline{\partial}$-Neumann operator. *J. Funct. Anal.* 195 (2002), no.**1**, 190–205

[N06] **A. Nicoara**—Global regularity for $\overline{\partial}_b$?-b on weakly pseudoconvex CR manifolds *Adv. Math.* **199** no. 2 (2006), 356447

[R10] **A.S. Raich**—Compactness of the complex Green operator on CR-manifolds of hypersurface type, *Math. Ann.* **348** (2010), 81–117

[RS08] **A. S. Raich and E. J. Straube**—Compactness of the complex Green operator, *Math. Res. Lett.*, **15** n. 4 (2008), 761–778

[Sh85] **M.C. Shaw**—Global solvability and regularity for $\bar{\partial}$ on an annulus between two weakly pseudoconvex domains, *Trans A.M.S.* **291** n. 1 (1985), 255–267

[S08] **E. J. Straube**—A sufficient condition for global regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann operator, *Adv. in Math.* **217** (2008), 1072–1095

[S10b] **E.J. Straube**—Lectures on the $\mathcal{L}^2$-Sobolev theory of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem, *ESI Lectures in Math. and Physics* (2010)

[S10] **E.J. Straube**—The complex Green operator on CRsubmanifolds of $\mathbb{C}^n$ of hypersurface type: compactness, (2010)

E-mail address: `vukhanh83@yahoo.com`